

Vol. XI

JANUARY, 1919

No. 3

BULLETIN

COLUMBIA
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY

COLUMBIA, S. C.

Published Quarterly by the Board of Directors of the Theological
Seminary of the Synods of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama
and Florida of the Presbyterian Church in the United States

(Entered as Second-Class Matter July 11, 1908, at the Postoffice at Columbia,
South Carolina, Under the Act of July 16, 1894)

FACULTY

THORNTON WHALING, D. D., LL. D.

PRESIDENT OF THE SEMINARY,
PROFESSOR OF DIDACTIC AND POLEMIC THEOLOGY.

WILLIAM M. MCPHEETERS, D. D., LL. D.,
PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS.

HENRY ALEXANDER WHITE, PH. D., D. D., LL. D.,
PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS.

RICHARD C. REED, D. D., LL. D.,
PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND CHURCH
POLITY.

JAMES O. REAVIS, D. D., LL. D.,
PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH BIBLE AND HOMILETICS.

EDGAR D. KERR, A. M., B. D.,
INSTRUCTOR IN HEBREW AND GREEK.

W. H. MILLS, A. B., D. D.,
INSTRUCTOR IN RURAL SOCIOLOGY AND WORK OF COUNTRY
PASTOR.

GEORGE S. FULBRIGHT, A. B.,
INSTRUCTOR IN ELOCUTION.

SMYTH LECTURERS.

F. L. PATTON, D. D., LL. D., Bermuda Island, 1918-19.

A. H. MCKINSEY, D. D., LL. D., 1919-1920.

J. W. CHAPMAN, 1920-1921.

COLUMBIA SEMINARY AND SOUTHWESTERN SYNODS.

The most interesting question in the field of Theological Seminary Education in the South is the future relation of the Southwestern Synods to our Seminary. A committee of the four (4) Synods formerly supporting the Divinity School at Clarksville have prepared a report to be presented to those Synods at their Fall meeting. The report, is as follows:

“To the Synods of Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee:

‘Your Ad Interim Committee, appointed a year ago, at the request of the Board of Directors of the Southwestern Presbyterian University, on the indefinite suspension of the Theological Department of that institution for lack of funds,’ ‘To investigate the whole question of theological education for said Synods (the Synods controlling the S. P. University), collect and digest facts, and recommend a course of action for the four Synods a year hence,’ reports as follows:

Your committee has tried to carry out the purpose for which it was appointed. The committee sees no immediate prospect of reopening the Theological Department of S. P. University for lack of sufficient funds. There is also no prospect of appealing to the Synods for increased endowment of this department, because the constituent Synods are closed to any such appeal by the peculiar conditions of their own educational work. It would be a mistake to attempt to reopen that department without sufficient endowment to make it the equal of any of the other seminaries. The time for this is not yet.

The Board of Directors of S. P. University turned over to this committee a number of overtures from other theological seminaries of the Assembly asking for a combination of the theological department of S. P. U. Such over-

tures came from Columbia, Louisville and Union Seminaries, each offering to do whatever their charters would permit in giving the four Synods part control on their Boards of Trustees. Your committee would remind the Synods of a legal difficulty in the way of any such formal connection with one of the other seminaries. It is this: The Synods have already given by the plan of Union and Charter the power to establish and maintain a theological department to S. P. University, and this power could not be removed or transferred without concerted action on the part of the constituent Synods to change the Plan of Union and the Charter of S. P. U. It is the judgment of the committee that it would be unwise to enter upon a change of Plan of Union and Charter, and detrimental to S. P. U.

Your committee believes that sooner or later, it will be necessary for these constituent Synods to have a theological school within their bounds, but the times are not ripe for even the agitation of that now. The war, and especially the lowering of the draft age of young men to eighteen, have so affected both college and theological education of the nation, temporarily at least, that it would be unwise to make any permanent changes till the times are more settled.

We recommend:

1. That the four controlling Synods acting together, respectfully decline to accept any one of the propositions of any one of the Seminaries without our bounds, looking to a formal connection of these four Synods with that Seminary as to theological education.

2. That the four Synods express their approval of the action of the Board of Directors of the Southwestern Presbyterian University, with the facts and conditions facing them, in suspending indefinitely, the Theological Department of the University.

3. That during the interregnum, while there is no theological school within our bounds, that the four Synods

acting together express their judgment, that each Synod and its Presbyteries be free to choose where they shall send their candidates under the regulations of the Assembly.

4. That the four Synods express their appreciation of the uniform kindness and courtesy of the different Seminaries and their Boards of Trustees and other officers, both to the Southwestern Presbyterian University and to the Synods during these negotiations.

Respectfully submitted,

W. MCF. ALEXANDER,
Chairman."

By agreement Drs. Hemphill, Moore and Whaling, Presidents, respectively, of Kentucky, Union and Columbia Seminaries, agreed that they would not attend these Synods and present the claims of their respective Institutions. The Synod of Alabama, however, adopted a resolution, to the effect, viz., that the Synod of Alabama takes no action in reference to the overtures of other Seminaries, since it already sustains official relations to one.

This resolution settles the status of Alabama in this most important matter, but would leave the Synods of Mississippi, Louisiana and Tennessee yet to take action. The Synod of Mississippi, at its last meeting, deferred action until next year; the Synods of Louisiana and Tennessee have not yet met, but doubtless will act in the same way. The following is the substance of the address which the President of Columbia Seminary would have delivered to the Synod of Mississippi, of Louisiana, and of Tennessee, had the question come up for consideration, and it is believed that the argument would have secured the well-nigh unanimous vote of the Synods to affiliate with the Synods of Alabama, Georgia, Florida and South Carolina, in the ownership and control of Columbia Seminary. It would be a misfortune if the three (3) Synods did not follow their sister Synod in this matter, and the arguments will be as convincing one year from now in

Mississippi, Louisiana and Tennessee as they are today. Mr. Moderator and Brethren of the Synod:

I appear before you by appointment of the Board of Directors of the Columbia Theological Seminary and under authority of its controlling Synods to make to you, as one of the Synods lately in control of the Divinity School of the Southwestern Presbyterian University, a very definite and easily understood proposition, viz.: We offer to the four Synods, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, to change the charter of the Seminary so as to give to those Synods the same proportionate per capita representation on the Board of Directors as is now enjoyed by the present controlling Synods of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Florida. A sum in arithmetic can be easily worked showing that the four Synods lately controlling the Divinity School at Clarkesville have a larger number of Presbyterian members than the Synods of South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, and this proposition, therefore, amounts to offering to you a major share in the ownership and control of Columbia Seminary.

Instead of offering you a trifling, infinitesimal fraction, like a tenth or a fifteenth or something like that, we offer you one-half plus, that is, more than one-half of the ownership and control of the Seminary; instead of offering you a fraction of a half, dividing ownership and control between our Church and another Church, we offer you something over a full half of the ownership and control of Columbia Seminary.

This is a remarkable proposition, which I feel confident cannot be duplicated and I challenge you to investigate whether it is really duplicated in any proposal now made to you by others. The details as to name, plans, policies, etc., are left for settlement to you when you become virtual owners and administrators of this great Seminary. You may ask why this remarkable proposition is made. In answer: FIRST. Because you are like us and we are like you. There is a solidarity betwixt the Presbyterians of Tennessee and Carolina and the Presbyterians of Mississippi and Georgia. They are of the

same strain and type and traditions and characteristics. It cannot be denied that there is a difference between various Synods in the Church; there are the border Synods of Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri and Kentucky, and then there are the Synods which constitute the heart of the Church somewhat revolving around Tennessee and Mississippi and including Carolina and Georgia. It can be easily established that Tennessee is more like Carolina than it is like Missouri, and Mississippi more like Georgia than it is like Kentucky in doctrinal views, and ecclesiastical practices. A woman could not preach for two weeks in one of the leading pulpits in Tennessee or Mississippi any more than she could in Carolina and Georgia. You may take the issues as defined by our General Assembly in 1918, which divided the Southern Church from the Northern Church, and in every one of these points, your Synods would stand with us, while the border Synods now seeking affiliation with you would stand—well who knows! Their ecclesiastical status is so uncertain that no prophet could certainly predict.

SECOND. You are offered this major share in a Seminary whose financial resources may not be quite so large as that of other Seminaries, but they are in a satisfactory and stable condition. We have an endowment of \$270,000, and we have property that is conservatively valued at \$150,000, while worth far more than this. Our endowment has increased in the last seven years by \$40,000. The policy of the Institution has always been to receive contributions from its Synods by private solicitation, and we have an income that amounts to over \$5,000, derived from this source. The Seminary has always pursued a generous policy with other educational interests located within its bounds. I read you the following letter from the Rev. A. C. Bridgman, Secretary of the Campaign in South Carolina for the endowment of its Educational Institutions:

“September 19, 1918.

Dear Dr. Whaling: In the revival that has come to the educational work of our churches in South Carolina,

Columbia Seminary has played a leading and munificent part. Dr. McPheeters was the leading spirit, especially in the organization of the joint canvass, beginning about seven and a half years ago. Later, when you came to the Seminary, as President, you gave yourself heartily and helpfully to our plans. The other members of the faculty also rendered valuable assistance in the canvass.

At the time of the canvass our men's College at Clinton was in hard financial straits and the Seminary very graciously came forward and advanced the *pro rata* share of the expenses that fell to the College.

By reason of the greater need of the College it was agreed that one one-half of the amount raised should go to it, and further, that should individual subscribers express a preference in favor of the College that that preference should be honored in the distribution of the funds. The Seminary very readily and heartily agreed to this plan, when it might have been contended for one-third of the proceeds.

There is another fact connected with the canvass that ought not to be overlooked, and that is that the Seminary provided headquarters for the canvass, including an office for the conduct of the work, and also living quarters for myself and family.

May I say that I have never enjoyed working with a body of men who were more interested, and more willing and self-sacrificing and more harmonious in their thought and action than the Joint Committee, one-third of whose membership was made up of the President of the Seminary and two of its Board of Trustees. I feel that you are to be congratulated upon the splendid record you have made in the face of many difficulties during the time you have been at the head of the Institution, and should be glad indeed to see a part, or all, of the Synods that formerly were supporters of Clarkesville ally themselves with Columbia Seminary and co-operate with you and other Synods in making it a yet stronger and more fruitful Institution of our Church."

A. C. BRIDGMAN.

The Seminary, through its Board, proposed to the Synod of Alabama the same service that we did for the South Carolina College and the same proposition was virtually made to Florida and Palmer College. We have kept out of Georgia because of complications there until in 1917, the Synod authorized a subscription of \$35,000 for the Goulding Professorship; so it will be seen our finances are in a strong and sound condition and are increasing at a satisfactory and progressive rate.

THIRD. You are offered a major share in the heritage and history of this splendid school whose position has been so central and masterful in the life of our Church. Because the history and the origin of the Southern Presbyterian Church is peculiarly associated with the Columbia Theological Seminary. The Theologian and Ecclesiastic whose views were embodied in the deliverances of the First General Assembly, was James Henley Thornwell, the author of the masterly paper adopted by that Assembly in 1881 setting forth to the world the reasons for the distinct existence of our Church, and next to him in influence was Benjamin M. Palmer, the Moderator of the first Assembly and the eloquent expounder of the same ecclesiastical principles. Both of these men were professors in the Columbia Theological Seminary, and both of them stood for the distinctive principles which originated the Southern Presbyterian Church. First, the supreme Headship of the Lord Jesus Christ in His Kingdom; second, the completeness and absolute sufficiency of the Scriptures as the constitution and textbook of the Church, to which nothing at any time was to be added, no matter how exigent might seem the circumstances; third, the spirituality of the Church as the supernatural institute of Redemption, rendering it impossible for such an institution to make political or other deliverances not justified by express statement of the Word of God. The constitution of the new Church, as reflected in the book of Church Order and Rules of Discipline, was written

within the walls of Columbia Seminary by a Committee of which John B. Adger was Chairman, and his hand penned more of its sections and articles than that of any other man, and the whole structure bears the marks of the Columbia Triumvirate: Thornwell, Palmer, Adger. This Institution, therefore, in the belief of its friends and administrators, is our most distinctly Southern Presbyterian Seminary, standing as guardian and trustee of the principles which gave birth to our Church and for the maintenance of which its life is given. The ties which bind the Seminary and the Church together are vital and organic, and both the Seminary and the Church stand for these great truths of the headship of Christ, the sufficiency of the Scriptures and the spirituality of the Kingdom of God.

FOURTH. You are offered the kind of an institution that you really want. This is proven by the fact that your Synods once voted to consolidate with Columbia Seminary. You knew then, and you, of course, know now, that this is the kind of a school that suits you. The great founders of the Divinity School at Clarkesville, Palmer and Waddel and Shearer (who still remains), are our kind and your kind, too. Palmer was three times professor at Columbia, and no one who knows his position could ever believe that he would vote to affiliate these Synods with an institution which was not marked by single ownership and by thorough adherence to the recognized policies and doctrinal views of the Southern Presbyterian Church.

FIFTH. This Institution is splendidly equipped for service today with a full corps of professors, all of whom are specialists in their respective fields, with a complete curriculum which covers the entire field of Theology study and with an ardent and enthusiastic body of students of high character and good scholastic preparation. The official figures furnished by the Secretary of Education will show that in 1918 the number of candidates receiving

aid in actual attendance upon our Theological Institutions was, 49 Union Seminary, 41 Columbia, 25 Kentucky Seminary. We offer you at least as good an institution and doing as satisfactory work in preparing candidates for the ministry as any of our Theological Seminaries.

SIXTH. The circumstances under which I present the appeal of Columbia requires that I should say that we are somewhat closer to you than Union spatially and geographically. I would not say one word of disparagement of that great Institution whose interests as a director I have most earnestly sought, and I treasure, as one of my most valued possessions a letter from its distinguished President expressing his esteem of the work I was privileged to do for that Institution. But I take it that none of us are in favor of Theological centralization and Union is already strong enough. We do not wish to put all of our cargo into one ship, and our brethren at Richmond ought to be content with the great constituency they already have without seeking a monopoly in Theological education. I am forced, also, to say that as compared with the Kentucky Theological Seminary, we have the advantage of single ownership, while they have the advantage of double ownership. That Institution cannot expect to enjoy, at one and the same time, the advantages of single ownership and the advantages of double ownership, just as Columbia cannot expect to have the advantages, at the same time, of single ownership and of double ownership. Columbia Seminary can represent you somewhat more directly and certainly than an institution which is half owned and controlled by the Church, South, and one-half owned and controlled by the Church, North. It would seem that no methods of exegesis could prevent the clear perception of this fact which is as axiomatic as two and two make four. We have a great regard for that splendid Seminary at Louisville, two of whose professors are alumni of Columbia, but we think that its natural and legitimate field is the border Synods of the two Churches which it represents, and that it ought

to seek extension not by breaking into the heart of the Church, South, but by bringing in Indiana, Illinois and Ohio.

In closing, brethren of the Synods, you cannot afford to turn this proposition down. You are offered a Seminary of your own which you can manage and dispose of as you please, and a Seminary with a great history and with a splendid Faculty and body of students and sufficiently endowed and equipped to do as good service as any other Theological Institution in the Church. Above all, I wish you to remember that this Seminary stands for the distinctive principles of our Church South, and that your vote to adopt it as your Institution is a decisive vote for the continuance of the great mission to which this Church was divinely called. I submit the issue to your wisdom, believing that your decision cannot be other than affiliation with the School which I have just offered to you, in the name of its Faculty, Directors and controlling Synods, and in the name of the Presbyterian Church of the South and of its Great Head and King.